

## OES-DEC Partnering Meeting February 20, 2008

### Attendees

Name	Org	Phone	E-mail
Chuck Howe	Flagstaff 8568	928.310.6844	<a href="mailto:chowe@azdot.gov">chowe@azdot.gov</a>
Rick Haddow	Globe 8368	928.812.1498	<a href="mailto:rhaddow@azdot.gov">rhaddow@azdot.gov</a>
Darlene Dyer	Flagstaff	928.779.7519	<a href="mailto:ddyer@azdot.gov">ddyer@azdot.gov</a>
Marc Kasper	Prescott 9143	928.772.0906	<a href="mailto:mkasper@azdot.gov">mkasper@azdot.gov</a>
Randal Pair	Holbrook	928.524.5468	<a href="mailto:rpair@azdot.gov">rpair@azdot.gov</a>
Tom Eckler	Flagstaff 9144	928.526.2582	<a href="mailto:teckler@azdot.gov">teckler@azdot.gov</a>
Thor Anderson	9130	602.712.8637	<a href="mailto:tanderson@azdot.gov">tanderson@azdot.gov</a>
Dee Bowling	9131	602.712.8640	<a href="mailto:dbowling@azdot.gov">dbowling@azdot.gov</a>
Paul Patane	Yuma District	928.317.2100	<a href="mailto:ppantane@azdot.gov">ppantane@azdot.gov</a>
Todd Williams	SE09000	602.712.7391	<a href="mailto:tgwilliams@azdot.gov">tgwilliams@azdot.gov</a>
Siobhan Nordhaugen	NRMG 9140	602.712.6166	<a href="mailto:snordhaugen@azdot.gov">snordhaugen@azdot.gov</a>
Ruth Greenspan	Phoenix 9132	602.712.6266	<a href="mailto:rgreenspan@azdot.gov">rgreenspan@azdot.gov</a>
Leigh Waite	MG ORG 9908	602.712.8166	<a href="mailto:lwaite@azdot.gov">lwaite@azdot.gov</a>
John Harper	Flagstaff 8500	928.779.7547	<a href="mailto:jharper@azdot.gov">jharper@azdot.gov</a>
Melissa Maiefski	EPG	520.388.4250	<a href="mailto:mmaiefski@azdot.gov">mmaiefski@azdot.gov</a>
Gary McRae	ADOT- Safford	928.432.4911	<a href="mailto:grmcrae@azdot.gov">grmcrae@azdot.gov</a>
Chuck Budinger	ADOT-DEC	928.777.5966	<a href="mailto:cbudinger@azdot.gov">cbudinger@azdot.gov</a>
Chuck Barclay	ADOT- NRMG	520.838.2831	<a href="mailto:cbarclay@azdot.gov">cbarclay@azdot.gov</a>
Paul Langdale	ADOT- NRMG	520.383.2830	<a href="mailto:plangdale@azdot.gov">plangdale@azdot.gov</a>
Anastasia Olander	ADOT	520.388.4259	<a href="mailto:aolander@azdot.gov">aolander@azdot.gov</a>
Bruce Fenske	8268	928.317.2138	<a href="mailto:bfenske@azdot.gov">bfenske@azdot.gov</a>
Julie Alpert	8668	928.681.6042	<a href="mailto:jalpert@azdot.gov">jalpert@azdot.gov</a>
Mike Traubert	5000	602.712.7765	<a href="mailto:mtraubert@azdot.gov">mtraubert@azdot.gov</a>
Wendy Terlizzi	9000	602.712.8353	<a href="mailto:wterlizzi@azdot.gov">wterlizzi@azdot.gov</a>

## Opening Remarks

Todd welcomed everyone and thanked those who came to attend. He promised “no rehash” of prior meetings, and asked that the team summarize old and new issues so the concerns could be addressed with action. He said we all want to evaluate where we are, streamline as we can. He informed the group that this meeting was not the end, that there will be ongoing meetings. District sponsors would join the team - John Harper and Paul Pantane. He let the participants know that before the day was over, they would be working in groups to create action plans.

Carla reviewed the agenda and ground rules.

### AGENDA:

Welcome and Opening Remarks	Todd Williams, OES
Introductions	ALL
Agenda Review/Housekeeping	Carla Carter
Overview of Servant Leadership Efforts	John Harper & Paul Patane

### Review of Core Business Function Handouts by OES Groups:

- Environmental Planning Group (EPG)
- Natural Resources Management Group (NRMG)
- District Environmental Coordinators
- Discussion of Work Order Process

Issues Identification and Prioritization	ALL
Small Groups Break Out	ALL
Report back from Groups	ALL
Next Steps/Meeting Date	ALL
Meeting Evaluation	ALL

### GROUND RULES:

- START & END on TIME – includes breaks and lunch
- LISTEN WELL and for UNDERSTANDING
  - Check in with person talking to ensure understanding
- EVERYBODY PARTICIPATES
  - Mix it up; Field and headquarters staff take the opportunity to mingle
- KEEP an OPEN MIND
- STRIVE for CONSENSUS
- STAY on TASK
  - Action orientation and goal orientation needed
- NO SILENT DISBELIEF
- USE WALL CHARTS FOR ISSUES:
  - One issue per post-it note
  - Print BIG & so it can be read easily
  - Use black sharpie to state issue
- LEAVE WORDSMITHING for LATER
  - Lots of people come from different backgrounds...Get the main idea/s nailed down.

## **Servant Leadership at ADOT - John Harper & Paul Patane**

**Paul:** The philosophy of servant leadership was explained. It includes working toward common goals, asking questions such as "What can you do to help the project get to bid?" Paul said he was excited to see the DEC come to the District. Paul stated "Bruce was brought on board to serve the team." Further guidance they gave included:

- 1) The key to success is relationships.
- 2) Don't put up barriers; we are all on the same page.
- 3) Remember the common goal. Work as a team.
- 4) You can even take it home and use the concept of serving your family.
- 5) Remember, the folk in Construction and Maintenance have been around a long time; win them over as a person before you "violate" something they are doing. Bruce fit right/in; he knew this and supported them.

**John:** Chuck did this work in Flagstaff and I rely on him for his expertise. He discussed his role as the sponsor of the MSLT (Maintenance Servant Leadership Team). He gave some history stating it was formed in 1996 to help many districts to share information, grow and provide necessary resources. He cited important recent accomplishments:

- 1) Hot series with career ladders.
- 2) Equipment operator training program

He advised the team to set a goal to 'pace the way' through....use communication – develop strategy. He shared that the success of the MSLT now has the SEO attending meetings. He reiterated that "We are all equal and we address issues one at a time."

They took questions from the participants.

**Q.** What was the most difficult change in shifting to MSLT culture?

1. Old authoritarian mindset
2. Delegation

**Q.** What were some accomplishments?

1. Pay ladders
2. Equipment Operator Training
3. Mover improvements
4. Knowledge sharing – thin overlays from Yuma shared with other districts.
5. Informal network time

## **EPG Business Activities - Thor Anderson**

Thor explained that EPG has been involved in DCR stage, but now they will be working with TPD for the 20 year plan. He said that there are 300 – 350 projects on-going; 150-200 clear each year. They standardize processes for FHWA so it is easy to review. This gets work done right and in a timely manner. He shared that they have saved 2 months on CE and more on more complex environmental docs.

Recently, work orders have been added. Extra funding (e.g. STAN funds) also makes new work. They have done a lot of work with quiet pavement – Hazmat, District Minor – all these lead to more work.

So we do a pretty good job keeping up – Dee added that we have co-located people who use standard processes (such as, SHPO) which assist in timeliness. Districts vary in their use of EPG as experts. This could grow.

**Q.** What type of procurement projects? Fencing, cattle-guards, end of year dollars that can work through OES.

### **Natural Resources - Chuck Barclay, Paul Candale**

Chuck began by stating that 10-15 years ago Natural Resources was “mow, cut and spray”. Shift in philosophy occurred which now has land management issues, BMPs, what works, what doesn’t. He said they found they were not timely, far from best – He gave the example of the vegetation issue.....He said they also ask “Is the project managed and analyzed for cost/benefit?” Over time, he shared his belief that they will have a picture of our state and will be able to keep Arizona the pearl it is.

He said there are four (4) orgs – with a small number of people per org with shoe string budgets. Likely future scenario? Natural resource orgs in District; Regional org would only be able to prioritize and address the top issues. Why does it matter? He shared his belief that all in the room have a responsibility to maintain the roads well, control sediment and erosion, etc. He explained how GIS and GPS offer data to improve decision making. Chuck continued through his list of responsibilities.

**Q.** How do you do your work if you are lean? Mostly through EPG –

**(Observation:** HPT Portal – Misconnect that should be addressed.)

**Paul:** Planning is trying to provide good information for decision making. Planners operate at statewide level and seek consistency between ADOT and the land management agencies. FS, BLM hear the same things – **I & R & P** have a program level analysis that offers decision makers the information they need.

**Q.** Should erosion control be given to NRMG? This is in conflict with what I was told.

### **DEC Role, 40% Core Duties - Chuck Barclay**

Chuck discussed what the DEC’s should be doing across the State. The report was distributed in the packet for attendees and discussed. As an overview, Chuck shared his belief that the DEC’s should:

- 1) Representative of District
- 2) Generalist

3) Know where experts can be found.

Out reach (#3) is important and the participants talked about it for a bit.

**Q.** Maintenance Coordination – Where is it? Chuck acknowledged that it seemed missing.

There was agreement to adjust the document to more clearly reflect maintenance coordination.

### **Work Order System – Julie Alpert, Bruce Fenske**

Five different types of work orders covered the process of a typical project but showed the variance of **OIS** or R/W mapping systems across counties. Julie walked through ways she makes project needs clear to OES – Bruce and Julie shared tips of how they work.

Discussed submittal to OES through Mike T. and Melissa M.- Measures of system to date – 11 on time, 2 late, etc.

Good overview presentation with slides. (Not attached)

**Q.** What is an easy overall metric? More detail instead of pass/fail and “in process” number.

**Julie:** We are supposed to track DEC work load but feel like we are tracking OES work load.

Todd made it clear that the type of work and the resources needed are also captured through the system.

**Q.** Is there a knowledge transfer out to all DEC? Nothing is consistent.

**Melissa:** She shared that they are creating an access data base for the work order system. She said it is almost up and running and passed out a sample to show how it can be sorted to report back status.

**Q.** If I can reach out and get my answers so I can move, do you expect me to wait and use the work order system? Doesn't seem efficient.

**A.** We need it for information about resources and are quite responsive.

Others commented that easy questions asked/answered don't need the system, but with key expertise they would use it to get the subject matter expert involvement.

## **Issue Categories and Specific Comments from Participants**

Note: During lunch, the issues that had been placed on the wall all morning were clustered for the team's review after lunch. Upon the return to the meeting, participants reviewed the initial work and ended up clustering the issues into eleven categories and then selected five to work on to create action plans. They ended up as follows:

### **MITIGATION**

- 404 Compensatory mitigation plans not being adhered to by District.
- Sensitive resource protection is minimal (Cultural, Bio, ER).
- Mitigation improvement suggestions not being fully taken into consideration. Suggestions are typically handled via e-mail, with no verbal discussion or valid verification of reasoning.
- Environmental inspection of mitigation measures.
- Mitigation follow-up is minimal (lack of enforcement).
- FHW a process review – mitigation measures compliance.
- Mitigation language: Enforcement/Archaic in new system.
- Revegetation
- Communicate Mitigation Measures
- Post construction compliance.

### **WORK ORDER**

- Work order requests by non-DEC may cause potential problems within District if DEC not being kept informed.
- Compliance manager copies the DEC from non-DEC requests in their District.
- How do we close out or handle situations where policy development may be lower down in the priority scale?
- If there is a policy issue it should be brought to the OES Management Teams weekly meeting by the compliance manager and resolved at that time.
- Web site to track work orders where DEC can find out status of work orders.
- Why is EPG tracking and responding to work order system? Coordination with OES?
- Melissa's data base make available electronically.
- Lacking new staff – EPG has staff to assist with process, no one else has the staff at this juncture. Additionally, EPG has many of the experts that can assist with completion of work orders.
- Do we need to identify timelines for work orders? I.e. is two weeks enough? (Julie's example).
- Use the work order process to plan ahead. Then the crisis will be minimized.
- Work order process should be renamed to EPG work order request.

- OES work order request more accurately describes could be directed at other DES groups besides EPG.
- A well developed INRMP should have input from work order system to track environmental issues.
- Agree that tracking work orders can help in the development of INRMP. Development of INRMP will involve a programmatic approach, will require consultants and funding. Critical need of procurement contract.
- Different processes and agency contracts among EPS, NR and DEC when doing environment clearances (sometimes confuses outside agencies).
- Shouldn't all District environmental issues be tracked through work order system regardless if DEC can answer and/or resolve on their own?
- Doesn't ADOT want to know what environmental issues are dealing with?
- Identify flaws or barriers to using the work order system? How can we better improve the system (intranet site)?
- Criteria for work order request? DE request or DEC request?
- R/W information needs to be accurate. Most information (websites) are updated infrequently (not as frequently as we'd like) so therefore we may not have identified the correct land owners.
- Educate Districts on the work order process.

## **COMMUNICATION**

- Greater overall communication throughout ADOT/OES.
- Who are decision makers in the ADOT Environmental program?
- RE project supervisors, etc. still contacting EPG for information after advertisement (asking for biology information for SWPPP delay, questioning mitigation, etc.).
- Coordinate in-house first.
- Policy decisions of OES being disseminated outside DEC structure. Inclusion of DEC in OES policy decisions. Then DEC can implement.
- No central point of contact at districts (EPG receives comments from district piece-meal). DEC repeatedly questioning "why wasn't I kept in the loop?" The typical response is "because your district hasn't kept you in the loop."
- Environmental message not being effectively delivered to contractor (by EPG on-call).
- Allow DEC/EPG personnel the ability to meet with each other when they need to (to build relationships and to resolve issues) without being babysat by OES Management.
- Hard to explain to District current (EPG, NR) status and why delays. Information must be two-way.
- Responsiveness follow-up is two-way.
- Yards – Ph I? Ph II? SWPPP?
- FTP knowledge sharing – crown ditch. Facts/50 gallon shoulder blade myths.
- NOI to not transition from Construction to Maintenance. How? When? What? Why? Who?

## **MAINTENANCE**

- Create standardized environmental clearance document for maintenance activities that everyone was; DEC for work they clear, EPG, NRMG, etc. So the overall clearance document is the same Statewide.
- Need to identify activities that must have clearances. Which activities can have “feel good” about its documentation?
- Should we shift all maintenance clearances to NRMG? What are constraints, limitations?
- Establish a consistent environmental program checklist for non-development request and flow chart.
- Programmatic approach to Maintenance projects.
- DEC need statewide programmatic clearances instead of DEC discretion.
- Blanket clearances for basic maintenance functions: i.e. shoulder build up, ditch cleaning, etc.
- What does the district need to move forward with a maintenance project, a clearance?
- Ultimate role/responsibilities for maintenance clearance?

## **CORE DUTIES**

- DEC core duties: Page 2 bullet 3 – “Quality assurance inspections I the field to verify compliance...”, should be a core duty and add 10% (enforce mitigation) their role (no giving away) ADOT playing cards; no speaking about NEPA, ESA, ARPA, etc unless EPG has said all they need to say; allow group representative (PM, Traffic, etc.) to speak on their expertise before you do. Page 2 bullet 1 “represent district for environmental compliance in the development process”. If this is to remain as a discretionary duty, ensure DEC is educated to not overstep.
- Maintenance coordination needs to be a core duty for every DEC.
- Share responsibility.
- Who determines and how is it determined whether DEC, NR or EPG does environmental clearance for develop projects, maintenance and emergency.
- Need to resolve the fact that we have DEC, EPG and NRMG all working separately to establish policy/procedure with outside agencies on the behalf of ADOT without determining what procedure or processes exist that other groups in ADOT have established. Should establish lead groups depending upon issue type and create protocol for internal coordination for overlapping responsibilities to determine who in ADOT should work on establishing process/procedure with outside agencies.
- Finalize core duties for DEC and provide to upper management to share.
- Duplicate work NR, DEC and EPG doing same tasks within same route and MP.
- Not best use of taxpayer dollars? Duplicate effort: necessary for different roles. DEC/EPG both attending pre-con meeting. DEC/EPG/NRMG reviewing Pre-Design documents (project assessments, etc.) Different roles. DEC/EPG attending Field Review/ Design KO meetings.



DEC/EPG/NRMG attending Wildlife TAC meetings (3 people potentially attending a Wildlife meeting). DEC/EPG both intensely reviewing section 404 permit package. DEC/EPG attending project meetings, where sometimes DEC oversteps role and sometimes gives away ADOT playing cards.

- DEC role in maintenance.
- DEC allegiance seems to be a very big issue. OES is environmental ... Districts need to understand process takes time. DEC should stop trying to make District happy and focus on big picture, ADOT environment.
- All DEC seem to be operating differently?
- Different Districts have different responsibilities for DEC, hard to know which DEC has what responsibility.
- Frame work studies role for District DEC.
- EPG District work? Need to include DEC.
- DEC coordination with other regulatory agencies role?
- Would recommend getting each DE to clarify the level of environmental risk they want to take and level of environmental documentation there.
- OES/NRMG/EPG going to land managers with different information (conflicting determinations on effect, etc.).
- DEC core duties: Page 2 bullet 4 "function as problem solvers for environmentally related activities not planned ..." should be a core duty at 2%.

### **ROADSIDE**

- Roadside Develop involvement, how do they fit in?
- Who commits NRMG for pre-treatment?
- Does NRMG need to be involved in pre-construction?
- Natural Resource verses Landscape (Roadside development)
- Roadside erosion control.
- We need Roadside Development at our meeting.
- Roadside Development their limited role authority?
- How to coordinate with Roadside Development?

### **TRACKING**

- Track all successes.
- No mechanism for DEC to easily keep track of sensitive resources.
- Are NRMG internal procedures documented?
- Districts not keeping track of 404 permit expirations.

### **ISSUE RESOLUTION**

- How to document OES/DEC issue resolutions?
- OES/EPG/NRMG involvement in District environmental issues.  
Coordinate!
- ID policy issues for DEC meetings.
- Asbestos – County notification (other than Maricopa, Pinal and Pima)  
There is none- ADEQ only.

## **TRAINING**

- Need to establish a training program to teach DEC what the various environmental regulations are. Give them the knowledge so they know what they can cover and what they may need OES assistance for.
- Knowledge sharing almost non-existent.
- Education, RE: work order.
- District training for vegetation management needed?
- Maintenance BMP training.
- Team building with NR and maintenance org supervisor.
- Who does what in relation to NEPA? How involved should the DEC be?
- I have a concern listening to what DEC is doing, especially in the 404 area, that there is more 404 educations needed – there are conditions on 404 permits that have to be met.
- We need constant DEC training on monthly basis or every other month for all environments, history and cultural areas.

## **STAFFING AND WORK LOAD**

- Need for additional staff and resources for EPG to support new duties that come with OES.
- Unequal distribution of work load between NRMG/EPG planners (1 NRMG planner indicated that “work was slow”).
- Funding (I lack the funds to pay my crew yet alone complete our mission).
- Ensure DEC are permanent employees.

## **MISCELLANEOUS PROCESSES**

- SWPPP enforcement and review.
- Will NRMG be following up on Construction BMP (SWPPP) when contract or ORS leave?
- Environmental permits/Coordination with Hazard Maintenance group.
- Spills T and E SPP arch.
- Glovani Facilities planning.
- Will INRMP contain budget estimates?

## **INFORMATION**

- Need resources maps – Gary and me, aerial photos.
- Information sources, maps and aerial photos.
- Roadway information.
- HPT portal access for DEC.
- Cultural Resources portal needs to be reviewed and updated. This requires funds and a procurement vehicle.
- Is data management support adequate for OES?

## **Next Steps/Evaluation**

The action teams agreed to finalize their action plans by Thursday, February 28<sup>th</sup> and get them to Carla for inclusion in the minutes distribution. They are attached to this document for review.

The next meeting was scheduled for an afternoon then the following morning of April 30 and May 1, 2008 at HRDC.

Meeting evaluation forms were distributed and the synopsis is attached following the action plans.

## ACTION PLAN

**CATEGORY:** Work Order

**GOAL:** A user-friendly mechanism to obtain necessary environmental clearances and technical assistance in a manner that is trackable.

**TEAM LEADER:**

**TEAM MEMBERS:** Ruth Greenspan, Thor Anderson, Randy Pair, Tom Edder

ACTION STEPS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
				B = Behind Schedule O = On Schedule C = Completed
1. Identify problems with existing W.O.	Team – Rep of each OES group and DEC	4 months	Time	
2. Make MM database available electronically	MM	2 months	IT help	
3. Educating the user on most effective way to fill out W.O.	MM and Team	Start date April 1 <sup>st</sup> 2008		
4. Develop committee to discuss threshold.	Rep of each OES group and 2 from DEC	4 months		
5. DEC identify up coming maintenance projects issues and make W.O. requests in anticipation.	DEC	Every 6 months		
6. System for filing of cleared W.O, what is adequate documentation.	Committee of OES reps and DEC reps			
7. Identify the W.O. community.	OES Management Team			
8.				
9.				
10.				

## ACTION PLAN

<b>CATEGORY:</b>	Mitigation
<b>GOAL:</b>	Ensure 100% compliance with mitigation measures.
<b>TEAM LEADER:</b>	Darlene Dyer
<b>TEAM MEMBERS:</b>	Paul Patane, Marc Kasper, Darlene Dyer, Paul Langdale, Julie Alpert, Rick Haddow

ACTION STEPS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
				B = Behind Schedule O = On Schedule C = Completed
<b>COMMUNICATION</b> 1. Communication with CCP – Jim Allan	Paul Patane	1 month	N/A	
2. Convey to add Environmental DEC at partnering.	DEC	Immediately	N/A	
3. Measuring Environmental in PEP process.	Paul Pantane	DE meeting	N/A	
4. District internal coordination/ meeting on draft mitigation measures and final design.	DE, RE and DEC			
5. Central point of contact at district with EPG.	Todd Williams/DE Meeting	TBD		
6. Develop escalation process for dispute of mitigation measures and charges.	EPG → DEC, EPG Group Manager → Dev Engr/DEC, Todd → Deputy SE(Doug)/DE			
7. EPG to develop standard methodology for marking San resource, include in plans and ensure complied with by EPG on-call	EPG	April	N/A	
<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES</b> 1. DEC QA in field (Verbal/Written – Document in Diary or	DEC/RE/DE			

other method) Note: Todd – Core function of DEC				
2..Escalation for non-compliance of mitigation measures	DEC → RE/DE, RE → Contractor DE → Contractor			
3. Maintenance addresses issues prior to project closeout; get actions on punchlist				
4. Develop (or integrate if possible ) Construction Quantlist/Checklist for TES/Inspectors				
<b>REPORT</b> 1. Develop a post-construction/post activity mitigation measures compliance report – applicable to Federal and Sate requirements/FHWA requirements/ACOE, ESA/etc.	DEC			
2. Send to EPG/NRMG as applicable				
3. Work with FHWA to develop Federal reporting criteria and process review	Committee to work with FHWA			

## ACTION PLAN

<b>CATEGORY:</b>	Communication
<b>GOAL:</b>	LUTU – Listen to us/tell us
<b>TEAM LEADER:</b>	Chuck Budinger, Bruce Fenske, Leigh Waite, Wendy Terlizzi
<b>TEAM MEMBERS:</b>	Timely and direct communication by sharing knowledge that may come from experience and guidance

ACTION STEPS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
				<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; font-size: 0.8em;">                     B = Behind Schedule                      O = On Schedule                      C = Completed                 </div>
1. Confirm conversation with email.	OES and DEC	Immediately	N/A	
2. Rotate DEC into weekly OES meeting,	DEC	Immediately	N/A	
3. Information sharing is Two-Way.	OES and DEC	On going	N/A	
4. Disseminate consistent message.	OES	On going	N/A	
5. Pre-Bid conference.	DEC	On going	N/A	
6. Direct environmental questions to DEC (Note: EPG Planner written on left border)	DEC	On going	N/A	
7. EPG planner (Note: What does this mean?)				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				

- Direct Env. inquires back to DEC to prevent information shopping
- Keep

## ACTION PLAN

**CATEGORY:** Core Duties – DEC

**GOAL:** Define clear role by group -DEC, EPG and NRMG. Establish core element for DEC.

**TEAM LEADER:**

**TEAM MEMBERS:** Todd Williams, Mike Traubert, Melissa Maiefski, Chuck Howe, Anastasia Olander , Siobhan Nordhaugen

ACTION STEPS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
				B = Behind Schedule O = On Schedule C = Completed
1. Define core responsibilities within EPG, NRMG and DEC.	Chuck, Siobhan and Melissa	April 2008	N/A	0
2. Define intentional overlaps.	Chuck, Siobhan and Melissa	April 2008	N/A	
3. Issue resolution process – UPE with Mit group.	Mike Traubert	April 2008	Skip + Margie proposed plan	
4. Agency Coordination Roles (communication protocol). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Topics – Dev, Ops and Const.</li> <li>Agencies</li> <li>Internal communication loop.</li> </ul>	Fall 2008			
5. Finalize core duties.	Chuck	February 22, 2008	N/A	
6. Review annually.	Todd/ Compliance	On-going	Nov's, NC's etc. – Evolution of OES needs.	
7. Define interactions with Water, Compliance and Permit Groups.	Chuck, Mike, Wendy, Todd and Compliance Mgr.	January 2009		
8.				
9.				
10.				



## ACTION PLAN

**CATEGORY:** Maintenance Clearances and Process

**GOAL:** Consistent statewide streamlined maintenance environmental clearance process

**TEAM LEADER:** Gary McRae

**TEAM MEMBERS:** Chuck Barclay, John Harper, Gary McRae, Dee Bowling

ACTION STEPS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
				B = Behind Schedule O = On Schedule C = Completed
1. Develop maps to include designated sensitive areas.	OES	Short Term – One year	1 FTE	
2. Develop checklist to aid in determining level of clearance.	EPG will gather any checklists from NP and DEC	Short Term – 4 months		
3. Standardized clearance form/format. EPG (EPG has one – will send around for comment, revise and make available).	OES and District	Short Term – 3 months		
4. Develop DEC maintenance clearance tracking process.	DEC	Short Term – 6 months		
5. Emergency maintenance process.	OES and District	Short Term – 1 year		
6. Develop program agreements.	OES in coordination with District	Long Term – 2 to 5 years		
7. Utilize PECOS	State Maintenance Engineer delegate, OES and District	Long Term – 2 to 5 years		
8.				
9.				
10.				